

Abhinavagupta is undoubtedly the most famous Kashmirian medieval intellectual: his decisive contributions to Indian aesthetics, Śaiva theology and metaphysics, and to the philosophy of the subtle and original Pratyabhijñā system are well known. Yet so far his works have often been studied without fully taking into account the specific context in which they are embedded – an intellectual background that is not less exceptional than Abhinavagupta himself. While providing fresh interpretations of some of the great Śaiva polymath's works, the nineteen essays gathered here attempt to map out for the first time the extraordinary cultural effervescence that took place in the little kingdom of Kashmir around Abhinavagupta's time.

Eli Franco is Professor of Indology at Leipzig University and an Ordinary Fellow of the Saxon Academy of Sciences.

Isabelle Ratié is Professor of Sanskrit at the Sorbonne Nouvelle University, Paris.



978-3-643-90697-7



9 783643 906977

Eli Franco, Isabelle Ratié (Eds.)

Around Abhinavagupta

Leipziger Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte Süd- und Zentralasiens

herausgegeben von

Eli Franco
Catharina Kiehnle
Klaus Koppe
Per K. Sørensen

Band 6

LIT

Around Abhinavagupta

Aspects of the Intellectual History of Kashmir
from the Ninth to the Eleventh Century

edited by

Eli Franco and Isabelle Ratié

LIT

Front cover: Annotated manuscript of Abhinavagupta's
Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī, © SOAS Library, London.
Back cover: Goddess (possibly Śārādā), Kashmir, late 9th century,
© Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (www.metmuseum.org).

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at
<http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN 978-3-643-90697-7

© LIT VERLAG Dr. W. Hopf Berlin 2016

Verlagskontakt:

Fresnostr. 2 D-48159 Münster

Tel. +49 (0) 2 51-62 03 20

E-Mail: lit@lit-verlag.de <http://www.lit-verlag.de>

Auslieferung:

Deutschland: LIT Verlag Fresnostr. 2, D-48159 Münster

Tel. +49 (0) 2 51-620 32 22, E-Mail: vertrieb@lit-verlag.de

E-Books sind erhältlich unter www.litwebshop.de

Contents

Introduction	vii
Orna ALMOGI (University of Hamburg)	
Tantric Scriptures in the <i>rNying ma rgyud 'bum</i> Believed to Have Been Transmitted to Tibet by Kashmiris: A Preliminary Survey	1
Lyne BANSAT-BOUDON (École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris)	
The World on Show, or Sensibility in Disguise. Philosophical and Aesthetic Issues in a Stanza by Abhinavagupta (<i>Tantrāloka</i> I 332, <i>Locana</i> ad <i>Dhvanyāloka</i> I 13).....	33
Yigal BRONNER (Hebrew University, Jerusalem)	
Understanding Udbhāṭa: The Invention of Kashmiri Poetics in the Jayāpīḍa Moment.....	81
Daniele CUNEO (Leiden University)	
A Hypothesis on Ruyyaka's <i>Alaṃkārasarvasva</i> in the Light of Jayaratha's <i>Vimarśinī</i>	149
Eli FRANCO (University of Leipzig)	
Why Isn't "Comparison" a Means of Knowledge? Bhāsarvajña on <i>Upamāna</i>	171
Elisa GANSER (University of Zurich)	
Elements of Ritual Speculation in the <i>Abhinavabhāratī</i> : Abhinavagupta on the Visible and Invisible Purposes of the <i>Pūrvaraṅga</i>	189
Alessandro GRAHELI (University of Vienna)	
The Force of <i>Tātparya</i> : Bhaṭṭa Jayanta and Abhinavagupta	231
Lawrence MCCREA (Cornell University, Ithaca)	
Abhinavagupta as Intellectual Historian of Buddhism.....	263

Shinya MORIYAMA (Shinshu University, Matsumoto)	
A Note on the Sāṅkhya Theory of Causation in Utpaladeva's <i>Īśvarasiddhi</i>	287
Yasutaka MUROYA (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna)	
Jayanta as Referred to by Udayana and Gaṅgeśa.....	299
John NEMEC (University of Virginia, Charlottesville)	
Influences on and Legacies of Somānanda's Conception of Materiality.....	341
Isabelle RATIÉ (Sorbonne Nouvelle University, Paris)	
Some Hitherto Unknown Fragments of Utpaladeva's <i>Vivṛti</i> (III): On Memory and Error	375
David SHULMAN (Hebrew University, Jerusalem)	
Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta on the Limits of <i>Rasa-</i> <i>Dhvani</i> : A Reading of DhvĀ 3.43	401
Raffaele TORELLA (Sapienza University, Rome)	
A <i>Vaiṣṇava Paramādvaita</i> in 10 th -Century Kashmir? The Work of Vāmanadatta.....	425
Judit TÖRZSÖK (University of Lille 3)	
Theatre, Acting and the Image of the Actor in Abhinavagupta's Tantric Sources.....	451
Somdev VASUDEVA (Kyoto University)	
<i>Lakṣaṇam Aparyālocitābhīdhānam</i> – Śobhākara's Resistance to Ruyyaka	495
Vincenzo VERGIANI (University of Cambridge)	
Helārāja on Omniscience, <i>Āgama</i> , and the Origin of Language.....	531
Michael WITZEL (Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.)	
Kashmiri Brahmins under the Kārkoṭa, Utpala and Lohara Dynasties, 625-1151 CE.....	609
Chizuko YOSHIMIZU (University of Tsukuba)	
Transmission of the <i>Mūlamadhyamakakārikā</i> and <i>Prasannapadā</i> to Tibet from Kashmir	645

A Vaiṣṇava Paramādvaita in 10th-Century Kashmir?

The Work of Vāmanadatta

RAFFAELE TORELLA

Bhāgavatotpala, more widely known in Kashmir under the name Utpalavaiṣṇava,¹ scattered his commentary on the *Spandakārikā* (*Spandapradīpikā*, henceforth SpPr) with often striking quotations from a work entitled *Samvitprakāśa* (henceforth SP), sometimes paired with another work entitled *Ātmasaptati*, their tone and content looking closely related to each other. If we know the name of author, which neither Bhāgavatotpala nor later authors ever mentioned, we owe it to Jayaratha, the diligent commentator of Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka* (henceforth TĀ). TĀ 5.154cd-155ab reads:

nīle pīte sukhe duḥkhe citsvarūpam akhaṇḍitam |
gurubhir bhāṣitaṃ tasmād upāyeṣu vicitratā ||

In blue, yellow, pleasure and pain the very nature of consciousness remains undivided: this has been said by the master. Therefore, there is diversity as regards the means [only].

“By the master,” Jayaratha says in his commentary (vol. III, p. 467), “namely by Vāmanadattācārya in the SP.” This passage is not found in the mss. of the SP (see below), but we can still give credit to Jayaratha's attribution, since the *śloka*, this time in full, is quoted in SpPr p. 18 (Dyczkowski ed.) as belonging to the SP, and

¹ In the two printed editions of the SpPr (both not fully reliable) by Gopinātha Kavirāja and M. S. G. Dyczkowski, the name in the colophon is given as Bhagavatotpala and Bhagavadutpala, respectively. What most probably is the correct form (Bhāgavatotpala) is found in the colophon of two mss. of the SpPr in the Research Library, Srinagar (No. 861, *raciteyaṃ bhāgavatopalena*; No. 829, *ity ācāryabhāgavato-utpalaviracitā*). These mss. belong to a group of four. Śāradā mss. of the SpPr which have not been used for the above editions (No. 2233 has *ity ācāryotpalaviracitā*; No. 994 ends abruptly while commenting on *śloka* 31).

moreover it recurs unchanged in the *Lakṣmītantra* (henceforth LT), which incorporates many verses from the SP (see below). The colophons of the *Ātmasaptati* and the other four Prakaraṇas which follow the SP in the extant mss. also mention his name as the author.

Vāmanadatta most probably lived around the middle of 10th century. The earliest authors to quote from him are the aforementioned Bhāgavatotpala, and Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha in the *Mṛgendravṛtti* (see below). Bhāgavatotpala, who quotes Utpaladeva (the *Īśvara-pratyabhijñārikā*, henceforth ĪPK)² but not Abhinavagupta, probably belongs to the second half of the 10th century. Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha belongs approximately to the same period, given that he also quotes Utpaladeva (the *Īśvarasiddhi*)³ and that his son Rāmakaṇṭha is quoted by Abhinavagupta⁴ (and Kṣemarāja – he is the *kairāṇa-vyākhyātr* referred to in the *Svacchandoddyota*, vol. I, p. 322).

The colophons of the SP and the other Prakaraṇas indicate that Vāmanadatta is from Kashmir and a brahmin, and they introduce us to his particular doctrinal position:

ekāyane prasūtasya kaśmīreṣu dvijātmanah |
kṛtir vāmanadattasya... ||

The mention of the Ekāyana testifies to Vāmanadatta's affiliation to the Pāñcarātra. The followers of the Pāñcarātra refer to one Ekāyanaveda which they consider the essence and primordial source of the four Vedas and also call "secret tradition" (*Īśvarasaṃhitā* 21.531: *ādyam ekāyanam vedaṃ rahasyāmnāyasaṃjñitam*). The lost *Kāśmīrāgamaprāmāṇya* of Yāmuna, according to what the author himself says in his main work, the *Āgamaprāmāṇya* (p. 79), dealt with the non-human nature of the Ekāyana-branch. In another passage of the *Āgamaprāmāṇya* (p. 40) Yāmuna points out that the Ekāyanaśākhins upheld – against the Śaivas – the birth, i.e. the limited nature, of Rudra. By crossing the references given in the *Haravijaya* and the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* (SANDERSON 2009, pp. 107-108), we have in Kashmir two subdivisions of Pāñcarātra: Ekāyanas and followers of Saṃkarṣaṇaśāstra, corresponding to Saṃhitā Pāñcarātra and Saṃkarṣaṇa Pāñcarātra, respectively. However, a

² Pp. 3, 7, 17, 38-39, 53.

³ 5. 55, quoted in *Mṛgendravṛtti* pp. 30-31 (ad vidyāpāda 1.11).

⁴ For a thorough assessment of Rāmakaṇṭha's date see GOODALL 1998, pp. xiii-xviii.

later Saṃhitā, the *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā*, links the Ekāyanaveda with Saṃkarṣaṇa (CZERNIAK-DROŹDŹOWICZ forthcoming), the Ekāyanas receiving the appellation of Āgamasiddhāntins, against the Vaidika termed Mantrasiddhāntins.⁵ According to the *Pādma-saṃhitā*, the Ekāyanas are a very special kind of Bhāgavatas: they do not need initiation into Pāñcarātra, being so to speak born Pāñcarātrins (CZERNIAK-DROŹDŹOWICZ forthcoming).

The presence of Vaiṣṇavism in Kashmir from early times is extensively documented by archeological and literary evidence,⁶ just as it seems probable that some of the Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās (cited apparently for the first time in the SpPr) were elaborated in Kashmir. Indeed, the SP is a *stuti* dedicated to Viṣṇu, and in it and the other Prakaraṇas several doctrinal references that are peculiar to the Pāñcarātra can be found, such as, for instance, the doctrine of the *vyūhas* in Prakaraṇa 4. However, as we shall see, this is a Pāñcarātra interpreted in a strictly non-dualistic sense, which makes it fully consonant with the contemporary schools of non-dual Śaivism. Many Śaiva masters do not hesitate to quote Vāmanadatta's work as an authority alongside other authoritative purely Śaiva texts and to support Śaiva doctrines. This gives the impression that the adhesion to a certain spiritual climate in the Kashmir of the time represented such a strong element of affinity, at the most elevated levels, that it succeeded in overcoming sectarian and doctrinal differences. One may also quote another example, that of Bhaṭṭa Divākaravatsa, belonging approximately to the same period (SANDERSON 2007, p. 255), and author of two works, the *Kakṣyā-stotra* and the *Vivekāñjana*, which are quoted as authorities by Śaiva authors, like Abhinavagupta and Kṣemarāja, despite their Pāñcarātra contents. This may appear all the more surprising when one thinks that the relations between Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas had often been – and were to become even more so in the future – such as to cast a shadow over the alleged tolerance of Hinduism (cf. DASGUPTA 1932, p. 18; GONDA 1970, pp. 93-94). Even when coexistence is, after all, peaceful, as in the Kashmir of the time, Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas do not go beyond a generic acknowledgement of the limited and provisional truth of the other, which is only admitted if

⁵ On Āgamasiddhānta and Mantrasiddhānta (plus Tantra° and Tantrāntara°), see RASTELLI 2003.

⁶ The relevant passages from the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* have been collected and studied in RAI 1955, pp. 188-194. See SANDERSON 2009a, pp. 58-70; 2009b, pp. 107-109.

subordinated to the absolute truth represented by one's own creed. This is particularly evident in the Vaiṣṇavas, who are much more oriented than the Śaivas towards the *ekāntavāda* (cf. GONDA 1970, p. 93). Anyhow, we see that in India even when one religious community accepts the partial truth of another, the delimitation between the respective authoritative texts tends to remain rigid. Śaivas and Pāñcarātrins are no exception to this. In criticizing the validity of the scriptures belonging to the Pāśupatas, Kālamukhas, Kāpālikas and Śaivas (*Āgamaprāmāṇya* p. 44), Yāmuna says:

As the authoritativeness of these Tantras is already vitiated by their mutual contradictions, it is not really necessary for them to be rejected with the stick of the Veda. [...] Let it not be said, how could Rudra, who is very trustworthy, promulgate such a vast collection of texts which are not authoritative ? [...] Or else one may reason that since Rudra may have composed such a system for the purpose of deceiving the world because he is known as a promulgator of deceitful doctrines, it is not even necessary to assume error on his part. (Transl. BUITENEN 1971, p. 71.)

It is known, on the other hand, that Kṣemarāja in the *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* relegates the Pāñcarātra to a very humble position on the scale of principles.⁷

The figure of Vāmanadatta does not have any place in the later Vaiṣṇava tradition, in which sectarian elements tend to prevail. He survives only indirectly since several stanzas of the SP are found to be incorporated or paraphrased in the LT (particularly in Chapter 14), a relatively late and eclectic text, which only begins to be considered an authority from the time of Vedāntadeśika onwards (GUPTA 1972, p. xx).⁸ Bhāgavatotpala, an author whose doctrinal and religious affiliation is very close to Vāmanadatta's (and Pāñcarātra's),⁹ and who quotes him so frequently, aims to illuminate and

⁷ See p. 17: *parā prakṛtir bhagavān vāsudevaḥ, tadvisphuliṅgaprāyā eva jīvāḥ iti pāñcarātrāḥ parasyāḥ prakṛteḥ pariṇāmābhyupagamād avyakte evābhini-viṣṭāḥ*. This does not prevent Maheśvarānanda from quoting as an authority a Pāñcarātra scripture like the LT (see below), most probably due to the emphasis this text places on the Goddess.

⁸ Some verses of the LT are cited in the *Mahārthamañjarīparimāla* (henceforth MPP): 14.5cd-6, cit. p. 65; 22.7ab, cit. p. 175. The probable date of Maheśvarānanda is very close to Vedāntadeśika's (around the beginning of the 14th c.; cf. SANDERSON 2007, p. 412).

⁹ Quite unconvincingly, DYCZKOWSKI 1992 argues (p. 28) that Bhāgavatotpala was in fact a Śaiva as shown by his referring to Śiva as his *abhimatadevatā* (SpPr, p. 7). It is instead clear from the context that by saying so Bhāgavat-

support the doctrine of the Spanda with an equal share of Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva authorities. He cites (p. 12) two passages, from a Śaiva and a Pāñcarātrin work, now both lost, that indicate the existence of a tolerant and all-comprehensive stratum of the two opposing schools that recognised each other as being united in non-duality. The Pāñcarātra text, the *Māyāvāmanasaṃhitā*, reads:

*viṣṇuśivasūryabuddhādirūpatayā tattacchakticakraparivārayutas
tatkāraṇaṃ bhagavān eka eva dhyānabhedenopāśyatvenābhīhitaḥ.*

In the form of Viṣṇu, Śiva, Sūrya, Buddha etc. and accompanied by the retinue of the various powers of which he is the sole cause, one is the Blessed One, variously named depending on the different kinds of meditation and the diverse rites.

And the Śaiva text, the *Kulayukti*:

*vedānte vaiṣṇave śaive saure bauddhe 'nyato 'pi ca |
eka eva paraḥ svātmā jñātā jñeyaṃ maheśvari ||*

In Vedānta, in Viṣṇuism, in Śaivism, in the Saura sect, in Buddhism and so on, one is the supreme, the own self, the knower and the knowable, O Maheśvarī.¹⁰

No mention of Vāmanadatta and his works (or of Bhāgavatotpala) is to be found in the extant works of Yāmuna, the first great systemizer and defender of the Pāñcarātra tradition, who must have lived a little later than Vāmanadatta (we must however take into account that his *Kāśmīrāgamaprāmāṇya* has not come down to us); nor is it in Vedāntadeśika or in Rāmānuja. The later Pāñcarātra tradition, once it firmly turned towards the *viśiṣṭādvaita*, erased the memory not only of Vāmanadatta, but also of a whole series of Vaiṣṇava texts apparently grounded on non-duality, whose existence is testified by Bhāgavatotpala's quotations, for instance the *Jñānasambodha*, the *Jābalīsūtra*, the *Ṣāḍguṇyaviveka* and others.

Vāmanadatta's teaching, on the contrary, was held in great respect by the Śaiva authors. Primarily by those who belonged to the great and variegated non-dual tradition, but not by them alone; in

pala is referring to the author of the *Spandakārikā*, not to himself. Then, the first part of his very name (Bhāgavata) leaves no doubt about his religious affiliation.

¹⁰ A verse from the SP (not extant in the mss.) cited in SpPr, p. 27 states that there is no difference between the qualities of Śiva and Viṣṇu (*bhedah sarva-jñatādīnām jñānādīnām ca nāsty amī | jñānasyaiva dharmatayā cidrūpasya sthitir yataḥ ||*).

fact, the first Śaiva to quote him is the *siddhāntin* Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, who in the above-mentioned passage (*Mṛgendravṛtti*, vidyāpāda, p. 153) quotes with approval, without citing the author or the title, two verses belonging to Prakaraṇa 2 (6, 56). The first of these two verses is also quoted in the chapter of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* on the Śaivadarśana, but in order to forestall drawing the mistaken conclusion that the *Ātmasaptati* was known to Mādhava, it must be said, as I have shown elsewhere (TORELLA 1979), that the chapter on the Śaivadarśana is not much more than a clever collage of passages that Mādhava has taken from Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's *Mṛgendravṛtti* and Aghoraśiva's *Tattvaparakāśavṛtti*.

The author who most extensively quotes from Vāmanadatta's works is Bhāgavatotpala. The total number of verses quoted is 42,¹¹ and they are all to be found in Prakaraṇa 1 (the SP), with the exception of six (five belonging to Prakaraṇa 2 and one to Prakaraṇa 5). Another literal quotation, this time from Prakaraṇa 2 (v. 30), can be found in Abhinavagupta's *Parātrīśikāvivaraṇa* (p. 214); a passage of his *Tantrasāra* (henceforth TS) may contain a reminiscence of a verse of SP.¹² Other quotations from Vāmanadatta's Prakaraṇas are found in Maheśvarānanda's MMP,¹³ Śivopādhyāya's *Vijñānabhairavoddyota*,¹⁴ Kṣemarāja's *Stavacintāmaṇivivṛti*¹⁵ and Bhāskarakaṇṭha's commentary on the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī*.¹⁶

¹¹ P. 3 (SP 107-8), p. 6 (SP 78-80), p. 8 (2.58), p. 9 (SP 24, 2.19, 5.26), p. 10 (SP 95), pp. 13-4 (SP 112-13), pp. 17-18 (SP 54-56), p. 18 (SP 49-50, 42-43, 45, one *śloka* from SP not found in the mss.), p. 19 (SP 53, 57, 59), p. 22 (SP 106), p. 23 (SP 103-4), p. 27 (SP 14, one *śloka* from SP not found in the mss.), p. 29 (SP 72), p. 31 (SP 27), p. 36 (SP 30), p. 37 (SP 31, 63, one *śloka* from SP not found in the mss., 12, 38-39ab), p. 38 (one *śloka* from *Ātmasaptati* not found in the mss., SP 10), p. 39 (1.92), p. 40 (2.47, 1.95), p. 41 (one *śloka* from *Ātmasaptati* not found in the mss), p. 47 (1.20), p. 48 (one *śloka* from SP not found in the mss.).

¹² TS pp. 8-9: *cinmātratattvaṃ... upādhibhir amlānam* – SP 3cd: *yad upādhibhir amlānaṃ naumi tad vaiṣṇavaṃ padam*.

¹³ See p. 20 (not found in the mss; cf. below); p. 21 (2.58); p. 22 (not found in the mss.); p. 25 (3.27 and 3.2).

¹⁴ See p. 109 (SP 13).

¹⁵ See p. 83 (SP 13).

¹⁶ Vol. I, p. 48 (SP 13); vol. I, p. 93 (SP 20); vol. I, p. 64 (SP 31); vol. I, p. 13, 302 (SP 36); vol. I, p. 71 (SP 39cd); vol. I, p. 72, 268, vol. II, p. 137 (2.6); vol. I, p. 54, 248, 412, vol. II, p. 203 (2.19); vol. I, p. 53, 218 (2.30-31).

The passage from the TĀ cited above permits us to touch on another question to which, however, it is not possible to obtain a definite answer, namely whether Abhinavagupta had been a disciple of Vāmanadatta. The fact that Abhinavagupta calls him *gurubhiḥ* is not cogent in itself, since the term may have been used in a generic sense.

Of the SP and the other Prakaraṇas only three mss. have come down to us,¹⁷ all of them incomplete. Two printed editions are available (only based on mss. A and B), one by M. Dyczkowski and one by Bh. P. Tripathi, both of them quite problematic with respect to the reading of the mss. and the emendations proposed.¹⁸ As we have seen, the work is divided into Prakaraṇas. SP is the title of the first one¹⁹ and was later extended by some, including the two editors referred to above, to the whole work. The SpPr, probably the oldest source for this collection of texts, uses the title *Samvitprakāśa* only for verses belonging to the first Prakaraṇa,²⁰ and *Ātmasaptati*²¹ for closely related verses, quite similar both in content and style to the SP. All the latter verses come indeed from Prakaraṇa 2, entitled *Ātmasaptati*²² in mss. B and C, and *Ātmasaṃstuti* in ms. A.²³ It is clear that Bhāgavatotpala considers the SP and

¹⁷ A: Research Library, Srinagar, No. 1371 (Kashmiri *devanāgarī*); B: Benares Hindu University Library, Varanasi, No. C4003 (*śāradā*); C: Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, Cod. Ms. Sanscr. Vish 5 (*śāradā*).

¹⁸ The two editions (both bearing the title of SP) are in fact only one as Tripathi's is virtually identical (including the typographical setting) to Dyczkowski's with the exception of a few corrections mainly of misprints. It would be possible to make some hypotheses about the reason why Dyczkowski decided to hand his edition over to Tripathi. About the "story" of Dyczkowski's edition see TORELLA 1994, p. 482.

¹⁹ In the three mss. the colophon reads: *saṃvitprakāśo nāma prathamam prakaraṇam*.

²⁰ Once he calls it *Samvitprakaraṇa* (p. 38); see below. There is only one exception: the quotation p. 9 from Prakaraṇa 5.26 is introduced by *uktaṃ saṃvitprakāśe* (see below).

²¹ On one occasion both editions of the SpPr (Kavirāja p. 112, Dyczkowski p. 37) have *uktaṃ hi svātmasaptatau*, which must be a mere mistake (at least, all the Srinagar mss. mentioned above read *uktaṃ hy ātmasaptatau*).

²² *ātmasaptatir nāma dvitīyam prakaraṇam*.

²³ According to the number recorded by the Srinagar ms. A (see below), the second Prakaraṇa should have had nineteen verses more than the 60 that have come down to us. Thus, *Ātmasaptati* might be either a mistake for *Ātmasaṃstuti* or (much more probably) an approximate reference to the number of the

Ātmasaptati as two distinct works.²⁴ Instead, Maheśvarānanda ascribes to SP one verse belonging to Prakaraṇa 2 (MMP, p. 21) and two verses belonging to Prakaraṇa 3 (ibid., p. 25).²⁵ Even admitting that it was Vāmanadatta himself that collected different treatises composed by him into a single work, he does not appear to have given this collection a particular title. Prakaraṇa 1 has the peculiar character of a philosophical *stuti* to Hari, also showing here and there subtle emotional nuances. The second mostly lacks these features, even though Vāmanadatta still calls it *saṃstuti*.²⁶ These features are altogether absent in the other Prakaraṇas, which makes rather unlikely the hypothesis that the Prakaraṇas as a whole might have had the collective title of *Viṣṇustuti*.²⁷ Of the 160 *śloka*s that Vāmanadatta himself mentions in one of the closing verses of Prakaraṇa 1²⁸ only 140 have survived. The title and the number of the extant verses of the other Prakaraṇas are as follows: *ātmasaptati* (vv. 60), *vikalpaviplava* (vv. 60), *vidyāviveka* (vv. 98), *varṇavicāra* (vv. 52), *paramārthaprakāśa* (vv. 27).²⁹ The Srinagar ms. A has seven and half more verses, belonging to a seventh Prakaraṇa, after which the ms. ends abruptly. B and C end with the colophon of

verses (79) that composed it. The confusion might have been caused by the previous part of the colophon of Prakaraṇa 2: *imaṃ vāmanadattena vihitām ātmasaṃstutim | adhigamya vimucyate jantavo bhavaviplavāt ||*.

²⁴ See SpPr pp. 37-38: *uktaṃ hi svātmasaptatau [read: hy ātmasaptatau] yadvad vastu svabhāvena jñānena viṣayīkṛtaṃ | tadvat tādātmyam āyāti jīvaḥ sarvamaḥ hy ataḥ || iti | anyat saṃvitprakaraṇe – yathāgninā samāviṣṭaṃ sarvaṃ tadrūpam iṅsyate | tathā jñānasamāviṣṭaṃ sarvaṃ tadrūpam iṅsyatām || iti*.

²⁵ The fact that Maheśvarānanda uses a single title, i.e. the title of Prakaraṇa 1, also for verses coming from other Prakaraṇas, has only one precedent, but an important one, that of the SpPr referred to above, n. 20. One may surmise that, even though *Saṃvitprakāśa* is definitely the specific title only of Prakaraṇa 1, the intrinsic importance and renown of the latter and its occurring first in the collection of Prakaraṇas (and also being by far the longest) may have sporadically given the occasion of an extended appellation.

²⁶ See n. 23 above.

²⁷ Cf. SANDERSON 2009a, p. 108. On the only occasion Bhāgavatotpala identifies three verses quoted by him as *stutau* (p. 19) they all belong to Prakaraṇa 1. Once Vāmanadatta himself refers to one *Haristuti*, but this is a hymn composed by his daughter Vāmadevī (4.78cd).

²⁸ SP 139: *śaṣṭyuttaraṃ ślokaśatam idaṃ bodhaṃ vināpi yaḥ | paṭhen madhuri-por agre bhaktyā mokṣaṃ sa gacchati ||*.

²⁹ After the colophon of each Prakaraṇa (except 1 and 4), the Srinagar ms. A records what was the original (?) number of verses: 79 (Prakaraṇa 2), 61 (Prakaraṇa 3), 52 (Prakaraṇa 5), 27 (Prakaraṇa 6).

Prakaraṇa 6, both having a lacuna between 4.90 and 6.22. The *devanāgarī* MS in the BORI Library bearing the title of SP has nothing to do with Vāmanadatta's work.

We are left with a preliminary question: what happened in the Vaiṣṇava circles immediately before the time of Abhinavagupta to make at least three significant Pāñcarātra authors – Vāmanadatta, Bhaṭṭa Divākaravatsa and Bhāgavatotpala – enter into the philosophical and spiritual orbit of their Śaiva adversaries? It has also been suggested the possibility of the inverted path (SANDERSON 2009a, p. 108), that is, the birth of the non-dual Śaiva philosophy from the influence of these eccentric Vaiṣṇava developments (*in primis*, Vāmanadatta's Prakaraṇas), a possibility that seems to me rather unlikely. It is not single points, but a whole constellation of typically Śaiva themes that can be found there, particularly linked to the complex philosophical world of Utpaladeva.

If, in this presentation of some aspects of Vāmanadatta's work, I mainly focus on Prakaraṇas 1 and 2 it is because, apart from their probably being in themselves his most significant texts, they are by far the most quoted by the Śaiva authors. First of all, in the complex mosaic of a philosophical *stuti*, written in a refined *kāvya* style, the SP proper, we find, within an undoubtedly Pāñcaratra doctrinal framework, a fascinating blend of rigorous speculation and devotional poetry, which at first sight reminds us of the then rising star of Utpaladeva, the actual founder of Pratyabhijñā, more or less contemporary to Vāmanadatta (and also often referred to by Bhāgavatotpala), with his collection of Śaiva *stotras*. The other Prakaraṇas share the same philosophical and spiritual attitude as the SP without, however, the *bhakti* nuances of the latter and the sense of intimate dialogue with Hari, emphasized by the frequent vocatives (*nātha*, *prabhu*, *bhagavan*, etc.) and above all by the constant addressing him as *tvam*.³⁰

Some of the fundamental themes of Utpaladeva – unobjectifiability of consciousness, subject/object relationship and problematicity of the very notion of *viśaya* – recur in several stanzas of the SP and *Ātmasaptati*:³¹

³⁰ Most of the *tvam* of the SP turn to *aham* in the verses incorporated into the LT, where the Goddess herself is speaking.

³¹ The text and numeration of the stanzas is according to my forthcoming edition (see Appendix).

2.5. The self cannot be object of cognition for anybody, what is other than it is not logically admissible. From the differentiation of the knowable derives the differentiation of the means of knowledge. If there is no such differentiation, then what might produce the differentiation [of knowledge]?

2.6. If the self were knowable, its knower would be “other”; but then the self would be[come] “other.” “Other,” in fact, is what is the object of knowledge.

2.56. Consciousness alone shines; that which is other from it is illuminated. What is illuminated is the object, and how can the object subsist without a subject?

1.10. Just as whatever is penetrated by fire is seen as being of the same essence as fire, in the same manner whatever is penetrated by consciousness is to be seen as being of the same essence as consciousness.

1.11. An intrinsic and definite status is inconceivable for things, dependent as they are on a subject that knows them, and consequently they can only manifest themselves, by their very nature, as having the knower as their essence.

1.12. The fact that things have You as their essence, no one disputes. Their capacity of being known demonstrates this: indeed, only that which in itself is light may be made to shine.³²

1.24. If knowledge (*vedanam*) knows something after bringing the knowable object to having knowledge as its own form, then how to speak of knowable object and knowing subject (*vedakatā*) as two distinct realities?³³

2.8. “Making [something] an object of knowledge” – the wise ones say in this connection – is the same as “making [it] one’s own.” What is universally accepted for any other reality, why should it not be so for consciousness?

2.9. What has not been made its own by consciousness (*saṃvidāsvikṛtaṃ*) cannot be termed “object of knowledge” (*viśaya*).³⁴ [But] what has

³² Cf. ĪPK 1.5.2 (cf. TORELLA 2002, pp. 111-112).

³³ The text remains doubtful owing to the oscillation in the mss. and old quotations between *vedanatā* and *vedakatā*; also the emendation of *vedanam* to *vedakāḥ* might be considered.

³⁴ Also the reading *saṃvidā svikṛtaṃ* “what has been made its own by consciousness” could be considered (this would anticipate the conclusion made in

been made its own by a certain entity becomes identical with such entity. [Then,] how can the very designation of “object of knowledge” stand?³⁵

2.35. While knowledge can shine autonomously being separated from the senses and without being muddled by the objects of knowledge, the same cannot be said of the object of knowledge.

2.36. It is said in this connection that in order to make known the objects of knowledge the three means of knowledge work separately being concerned with distinct classes of objects of knowledge. [But] the same does not hold for knowledge.

Another favourite topic of Utpaladeva’s discourse is the alleged externality of the object of knowledge (ĪPK 1.8.5, 1.8.7; cf. TORELLA 2002, pp. 148-150). In the same vein, Vāmanadatta says:

2.32. Even establishing the other as other is not possible until the other is assimilated by the self, since only when it is known does the other become the other.

2.44. If it were possible to define an object as being external even when it has entered one’s consciousness, then it would be external to consciousness itself, so how could it be said to be “its” [of consciousness]?

2.45. If, on the other hand, it has not entered one’s consciousness, how can its existence be known, since only consciousness has the task of hunting down being and non-being?

The examination of the nature of relation is closely connected with Utpaladeva’s treatment of the same topic in ĪPK 1.2.10-11 (TORELLA 2002, pp. 95-98), 2.4.14 (TORELLA 2002, p. 183) and the *Sambandhasiddhi*.

2.17. There can be no relationship between two things complete and realised in themselves (*siddha*), because all expectation is lacking between them; and not even between two that are not realised and established, because as such they would not exist. So any relationship in reality does not exist.

2.54. What is real/existing (*satān*) is without any such “requiring” because it is already complete and realised in itself, nor conversely is “non-requiring” possible in what is non-existent owing to its non-realisa-

the following *ardhaśloka*).

³⁵ Cf. e.g. Utpaladeva’s *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛti* ad 1.4.1 (TORELLA 2007b, p. 544).

tion. Things lacking “dependency” have neither the nature of the knower nor of the knowable.

The status of cause presupposes sentiency. Only the conscious agent subject can be a causal agent (ĪPK 2.4.1-21; cf. TORELLA 2002, pp. 175-188).

1.63. It is well known that everything has You as cause, since Your presence is apparent in everything. Given that everything shows the presence of consciousness, the cause [of everything] cannot be something without consciousness.

2.22. Whatever is denied the quality of active subject cannot assume the role of instrument, etc. [...]

Vāmanadatta appears also reminiscent of how Utpaladeva deals with the theme of memory in ĪPK 1.2.3, 1.3.1ff. (cf. TORELLA 2007b).

1.20. You, always omniscient, are present in the heart of everyone: if this were not so, how otherwise could one account for memory, whose object is something that no longer exists?

The presence of Bhartṛhari’s teaching is evident at several places of Vāmanadatta’s works, and, as is well known, it was through Utpaladeva that Bhartṛhari became one of the main pillars of non-dual Śaiva philosophy (TORELLA 2009).

1.7. It is merely a question of the power of the word: that is, the fact that it brings about a fragmentation of the real, which itself would be unitary, by virtue of a multiplicity of functions.

5.26. The word is the cause of all human activities: this is what reason shows, it is not only scripture that says so. In fact, there is no operation whatsoever without the work of discursive thought, nor is there discursive thought without the word.

The concept of *pratibhā* as the ultimate ground for the means of knowledge appears to be nourished with Utpaladeva’s ideas as expressed particularly in the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛti* (in turn, being a development of Bhartṛhari’s doctrine):³⁶

2.37. Sensorial knowledge derives directly from the object, inferential knowledge comes from the relation [between objects]; it has been said

³⁶ Cf. TORELLA 2013.

that they [sensorial knowledge and inferential knowledge] are the root of *āgama*. No other means of knowledge exists.

2.38. It is required that, in turn, these three means of knowledge have intuition as their own soul, otherwise it would impossible to account for ascertainment of truth and error.

2.39ab. Intuition is only known by introspective self-awareness; it is present in a form exempt from succession (*akramātmikā*) within the various activities.³⁷

Just like Utpaladeva, Vāmanadatta makes frequent use of the simile of the mirror or crystal and the reflection on them to account for the relationship between consciousness and the images of the allegedly external objects.

1.51. Just as the child has no separate cognition of the mirror without his face [reflected in it], just so he who is not wise does not grasp the consciousness from which the knowable has been extracted.

1.54-56. Just as the true nature of a crystal continuously coloured by other things is not perceived owing to its excessive transparency, in the same way, O Blessed One, Your own body, which is united with the various beings, owing to its absolute limpidity is not perceived without them. Neither for this [reason] can we affirm that such a crystal does not exist separately from whatever colours it, or that the pure body of consciousness does not exist once liberated from the form of things.

1.57-59. Just as it is impossible to indicate separately the intrinsic existence of a universal from which all particulars have been removed – but this does not imply that it does not exist –, and just as it is impossible to indicate the intrinsic existence of gold once it has been freed from its various forms, such as earring, etc. – but this does not imply that it does not exist –, so be it said of Your permanent, intimate, pure nature, once pleasure and pain have been eliminated. It consists of consciousness, only knowable through introspective intimate awareness.

1.40. Pleasure and pain do not appear, discrimination has no firm ground: everything appears the same once You, the sun of consciousness, rise.

³⁷ If we accept the reading *kramātmikā*, transmitted in all the extant mss., the meaning does not change significantly: “it [only] appears in a successive form within...”

1.41. For the blind You are the one in whom there is no darkness, for the deaf You are the one in whom the Voice never disappears. Starting from Brahmā to the animals, You are the same in the knowledge of everybody.

Hari is present at all levels of ordinary reality. In fact, since everything is equally penetrated by Him, there is no real difference between *mokṣa* and *saṃsāra*. If the various ordinary reality can occur in its multifariousness it is precisely because of His constituting its permanent and undifferentiated basis (cf. ĪPK 2.3.15b *samabhittitalopame*; ĪPK 1.3.6-7, 2.4.19; cf. TORELLA 2002, pp.103-104, 186).

1.95. No ordinary activity – whether corporeal or verbal or mental – can take place if Thou, O Lord, art not already present in it and established beforehand.³⁸

1.89. Two persons who meet and speak of ordinary things thereby express something that however has You as its final subject, [even] without speaking of You [directly]. [...]

1.36. Albeit directly perceptible, in that You transcend all conceptual processes, You are “forgotten” – like something in front of someone whose mind is elsewhere.

1.39. Lights do not shine if Your light does not rise. You are the only one that can truly be called light; all the others are like the darkness.

2.58. In actual fact, there is no bondage, and there being no bondage, there is no liberation either. These two entities are both fabricated by discursive thought and in themselves are nothing.

1.60. I bow to Brahman which is without specification, partless, outside space and time, light to itself, exclusively consisting of consciousness, perennially risen.

1.61. Were You not exempt from particularization among particulars, the comprehension of the particular would be impossible as everything resides in itself.

1.62. In You, Lord, who are the cause, there is no differentiation, then how could differentiation be in the effects forming this world? Therefore, o Padmanābha, the world is without differentiation.

³⁸ Cf. the so-called *ādisiddhasūtra* (1.1.2) of ĪPK.

1.64. You are the substratum of everything, made of everything and transcending everything. How is it possible that there be space and time in You, who are infinite and without action (*niṣkriyātmani*)?³⁹

1.66. The wise ones know you to be what never declines from its own nature, what is not modified by other realities, what is not delimited by other realities, this permanent being You are.

1.67. Time, etc. arise from You with the aim of delimiting what can be delimited. But what can time etc. do to You, whose own form is immeasurable?

In the motif of the presence of Hari, or consciousness, in the empty space that separates two physical realities, or two thoughts or sensorial experiences, or two phonemes in a word, we can detect Vāmanadatta's acquaintance with the texts of the Spanda school and with Śaiva scriptures such as the *Vijñānabhairava*.⁴⁰

1.4. The mind that, having expelled conceptual constructs, remains in the middle state, experiences there the immaculate flow of consciousness.

1.42. Always pure does this perception remain, albeit variegated according to the various forms. At the moment in which the passing from one form to another occurs, at that moment too perception is [fully] immaculate.

1.43. Just as a garment originally white and then dyed cannot take any other colour unless it first returns to its original white [...]

1.44. [Just as] he who pronounces a phrase, how could he pass from one phoneme to another, if in the interval, he did not repose in You, who are pure consciousness?

1.45. In the same way, consciousness, which is pure by nature and assumes one form or another, stays pure in the interval between abandoning one form and passing on to another.

* * *

³⁹ The absence of *kriyā* in Hari, stated also in SP 73b, as a point of apparent disagreement with the Śaiva *paramādvaita*, will be treated in my forthcoming edition and translation.

⁴⁰ Very intriguing is the mention of the Krama goddess Kālakaṣṇī in 4.13d.

The season in which a few brilliant personalities of Pāñcarātra surrendered to the fascination by the philosophers and spiritual masters of the Śaiva *paramādvaita* was short, in any case lasting no more than three to four decades. All the same, the mainstream of Pāñcarātra never forgave them, and committed them to disdainful oblivion. Their memory however has survived for centuries in the Śaiva circles, proud perhaps of having attracted such brilliant outsiders.

APPENDIX

VĀMANADATTA'S VERSES QUOTED IN THE PAPER (ACCORDING TO R. TORELLA'S FORTHCOMING EDITION)

A = Kāśmīri Devanāgarī Ms (Śrinagar); B = Śāradā Ms (Benares);
C = Śāradā Ms (Göttingen); E = M.S.G. Dyczkowski edition; V =
Bh.P. Tripathi (Vāgīśa Śāstrī) edition

- 1.4. *dūrāpāstavikalpena cetasā yo*⁴¹ 'nubhūyate |
madhyamāṃ vṛttim āsthāya sa saṃvitprasaro 'malah ||
1.7. *kevalaṃ vākprabhāvo*⁴² 'yaṃ yad abhinnaṃ api svayam |
*vibhodayati sā vastu svetikartavyatāvaśāt*⁴³ ||
1.10. *yathāgninā samāviṣṭaṃ sarvaṃ tadrūpaṃ īkṣyate*⁴⁴ |
*tathā jñānasamāviṣṭaṃ sarvaṃ tadrūpaṃ īkṣyatām*⁴⁵ ||⁴⁶
1.11. *pramātrapekṣabhāveṣu*⁴⁷ na hy avasthāvakaḥ |

⁴¹ °na cetasā yo ABC, na cen mājā EV. (LT 14.12b cetasā yatra bhūyate; the more correct yena is the reading of mss. ADEFG).

⁴² vākprabhāvo AC, vākprabho then corrected to vākprabhāvo B, vākprabhāvo EV.

⁴³ sā vastu svetikartavyatā° ABC, tad vastuṣy iti kartavyatā° EV.

⁴⁴ īkṣyate CEV, īkṣyatām corrected to īkṣyate B, īkṣyatām A (īkṣyate cit. in SpPr, p. 38).

⁴⁵ īkṣyatām EV, īkṣatām C; īkṣyatām cit. in SpPr, p. 38 (cf. LT 14.14 tathā saṃvitsamāviṣṭaṃ cetyaṃ saṃvittayekṣyate).

⁴⁶ The *ardhaśloka*, omitted in AB, has been added in both mss. in the margin, where however it is only partly legible (*sarvaṃ ta...kṣyate na sa... A, tathā jñā...rve? tadrūpaṃ ī... B*). It is quoted in full in SpPr, p. 38.

⁴⁷ °apekṣa° em, °apekṣā° ABC (in AB the original *pramātr*° has been then cor-

- yatas tataḥ prakāśantām*⁴⁸ *svayam eva tadātmanā* ||
- 1.12. *tvadātmakatvaṃ bhāvānām vivadante*⁴⁹ *na kecana* |
*yat prakāśyadaśām yātā nāprakāśaḥ*⁵⁰ *prakāśyate*⁵¹ ||
- 1.20. *sarvajñaḥ sarvadaiva tvaṃ sarvasya hṛdaye na cet* |
*kenānyathāsyā*⁵² *saṃbhāvyā naṣṭārthaviṣayā smṛtiḥ* ||
- 1.24. *vedyaṃ svarūpatām nītvā yadā jānāti vedanam*⁵³ |
*tadānīm vedyatā kā syāt kā vā vedakatāparā*⁵⁴ ||
- 1.36. *vikalpātūtarūpatvāt pratyakṣo 'py asi viśmṛtaḥ* |
purahsthitō yathā bhāvaś cetaso 'nyābhilāṣiṇaḥ ||
- 1.39. *na prakāśaḥ prakāśante*⁵⁵ *tvatprakāśodayaṃ vinā* |
prakāśākhyas tvaṃ eko 'taḥ sarve 'nye tamasā samāḥ ||
- 1.40. *sukhaduḥkhe na bhāsete*⁵⁶ *viveko nāvatiṣṭhate* |
*sarvaṃ*⁵⁷ *samaṃ samābhāti*⁵⁸ *cidbhānāv udite tvayi* ||
- 1.41. *andhānām apy anandhas tvaṃ*⁵⁹ *mūkānām anapāyivāk* |
*āviriṇcāt tiryagantaṃ samaḥ*⁶⁰ *sarvasya vedane* ||
- 1.42. *sadaiva śuddho 'nubhavo 'yaṃ pratyākāraḥ* |

rected to *pramātra*°), *pramātrpakṣabhāveṣu* EV.

- ⁴⁸ *prakāśantām* ABC (*prakāśantām* corrected to *prakāśantām* A), *prakāśase* EV.
- ⁴⁹ *vivadante* EV (indeed, P 1.3.47 prescribes *ātmanepada*), *vivadanti* ABC; *vivadante* cit. SpPr, p. 37 (reading confirmed by the Srinagar mss. listed above).
- ⁵⁰ *prakāśyadaśām yātā nā*° A, *prakāśyadaśāya tanau* (*tā* in the margin seems to correct *ta*-) B, *prakāśyadaśāyāto nā*° C, *prakāśyadaśām yāto nā*° EV. SpPr p. 37 has *prakāśyadaśām yāto* (*prakāśyadaśām yātā* ms. No. 829, 2233, *prakāśadaśām yātā* ms. No. 861, *prakāśadaśām yātām* ms. No. 994).
- ⁵¹ *prakāśyate* C, *prakāśate* ABEV (this is also the reading in SpPr, p. 37, but mss. No.s 829 and 861 have *prakāśyate*).
- ⁵² *kenā*° ACEV, *kānā*° corrected to *kenā*° B.
- ⁵³ *vedanam* AEV, *vedanām* C, *vedanām* corrected to *vedanam* B.
- ⁵⁴ *vedakatā*° ABC, *vedanatā*° em. (EV); *vedanatā*° cit. in SpPr, p. 9, and all mss. (also possible).
- ⁵⁵ *prakāśante* ABEV, *prakāśyante* C.
- ⁵⁶ *sukhaduḥkhe na bhāsete* ABC, *akhandās te na bhāsete* EV.
- ⁵⁷ *sarvaṃ* ABC, *sarve* EV.
- ⁵⁸ *samābhāti* ABC, *samābhānti* EV.
- ⁵⁹ *anandhas tvaṃ* ABC, *anandhatvaṃ* EV.
- ⁶⁰ *āviriṇcāt tiryagantaṃ samaḥ* ABC, *avacinvanti mārگاṃ taṃ samaṃ* EV.

*ākārāntarasamcārakāle tadāpi*⁶¹ *nirmalaḥ* ||

1.43. *yathā jātyā sitaṃ vastraṃ raktaṃ rāgeṇa kenacit* |
*na tad aprāpya*⁶² *śuklatvaṃ punā*⁶³ *rāgāntaram śrayet* ||

1.44. *ayam uccārayan vākyaṃ varṇād varṇaṃ kathaṃ vrajet* |
yāvan madhye na viśrāntas tvayi śuddhacidātmani ||

1.45. *evaṃ śuddhā citir jātyā*⁶⁴ *yadākāroparāgiṇī* |
tattiyāgāparasamcāramadhye śuddhaiva tiṣṭhati ||

1.51. *mukhaṃ vinā yathādarśaṃ pṛthag bālo*⁶⁵ *na manyate* |
*tathā samuddhṛtajñeyaṃ*⁶⁶ *jñānaṃ nāvaity apanḍitaḥ*⁶⁷ ||

1.54. *atyantācchasvabhāvatvāt sphaṭikasya yathā svakam* |
*rūpaṃ paroparaktasya nityaṃ naivopalabhyate*⁶⁸ ||

1.55. *tathā bhāvasamāyuktaṃ bhagavaṃs tāvakaṃ vapuḥ* |
atyantanirmalatayā pṛthak tair nopalabhyate ||

1.56. *naitāvatāsau*⁶⁹ *sphaṭikaḥ pṛthan nāsty eva*⁷⁰ *rañjanāt* |
bhāvarūpaparityaktā tava vā nirmalā tanuḥ ||

1.57. *yathoddhṛtaviśeṣasya sāmānyasya nijasthitiḥ*⁷¹ |

⁶¹ *tadāpi* conj., *tasyāpi* ABCEV. The text remains doubtful (cf. LT 14.24 *sadai-vāpratibaddhāyā bhāntiyā eva vapur mama | pratyakṣaṃ cetyasaṃcārakāle 'pi vimalātmanām (viditātmanām mss. ABCDG)* ||).

⁶² *na tad aprāpya* ABC, *tatpadaprāpta*^o EV (probably referring to the quotation in SpPr, p. 18 *tatpadaṃ prāpta*^o, found in all mss.). Cf. LT 14.25c *punaḥ sva-varṇaṃ aprāpya*.

⁶³ *punā* BEV, *puna* AC.

⁶⁴ *citir jātyā* BCEV, *cinnirvṛtṭyā* A.

⁶⁵ *bālo* ABC, *bimbo* EV.

⁶⁶ *samuddhṛta*^o BC, *samuddhṛtaṃ* AEV.

⁶⁷ *jñānaṃ nāvaity (nāvety C) apanḍitaḥ* ABC, *jñātaṃ na dvaitapanḍitaiḥ* EV.

⁶⁸ *naivo*^o em. (cf. LT 4.36 *atyantācchasvabhāvatvāt sphaṭikādir yathā maṇiḥ | uparakto japādyais tu tena rūpeṇa nekṣyate* ||), *evo*^o ABC (B has in the left margin: *nopalabhyate iti dvayor anuṣaṅgaḥ*, then cancelled) EV (*evo*^o also in Sp.Pr, p. 17, and all mss.).

⁶⁹ *naitāvatā*^o CEV (cit. in SpPr, p. 18), *etāvatā* corrected to *naitāvatā*^o B, *etāvatā*^o A.

⁷⁰ *nāsty eva* em. (cf. EV; cit. in SpPr, p. 18, and all mss.), *nāste na* ABC. Cf. LT 14.37cd *pṛthag janair na lakṣyāsmi naivāhaṃ nāsmi tāvatā*.

⁷¹ *nijā*^o ABC, *nijā* EV (*nijā* cit. in SpPr p. 19 and all mss.)

- pr̥than̥ na śakyā nirdeṣṭuṃ na ca tan nāsti*⁷² *tāvatā* ||
 1.58. *yathoddhṛtakuṇḍalādeḥ*⁷³ *kanakasya svayaṃ sthitiḥ* |
<pr̥than̥ na śakyā nirdeṣṭuṃ na ca tan nāsti tāvatā> ||⁷⁴
 1.59. *evaṃ nityā nijā śuddhā sukha*⁷⁵ *-duḥkhaniṣedhanāt*⁷⁶ |
svasaṃvedanasamvedyā tava saṃvinmayī sthitiḥ ||
 1.60. *aviśeṣaṃ nirvibhāgam adeśaṃ kālavarjitaṃ*⁷⁷ |
svajyotiś cidghanaikāntaṃ naumi brahma sadoditā ||
 1.61. *nirviśeṣo viśeṣeṣu nābhaviṣyad bhavān yadi* |
viśeṣāvagatir na syāt sarvasya svātmani sthithēḥ ||
 1.62. *tvayi nātha na bhedo 'sti kāraṇe tat*⁷⁸ *kuto bhidā* |
kārye 'smin syāt padmanābha nirviśeṣaṃ tato jagat ||
 1.63. *tvatkāraṇatvaṃ*⁷⁹ *sarvasminn api jñātaṃ*⁸⁰ *tvadanvayāt*⁸¹ |
saṃvitsamanvite viśve nāsaṃvit kāraṇaṃ bhavet ||⁸²
 1.64. *sarvādhāre sarvamaye sarvataś cātirekiṇi* |
*tvayy anante ko nu deśaḥ*⁸³ *kālo vā niṣkriyātmani* ||

⁷² *tan nāsti* ABC, *tatrāsti* EV (cit. in SpPr, p. 19, but all mss. have *tan nāsti*).

⁷³ *yathoddhṛtakuṇḍalādeḥ* em. (cf. EV), *yathoddhṛtā kuṇḍalādeḥ* BC, *yathoddhṛtā kuṇḍalādiḥ* A (*yathoddhṛtā kuṇḍalādeḥ* is also in SpPr, p. 19; of the four mss. only ms. No. 861 has the *śloka*, in the latter form).

⁷⁴ An *ardhaśloka* is omitted in the mss, probably due to homoteleuton; the *ardhaśloka* that I have tentatively added comes from the quotation of the *śloka* in SpPr, p. 19 (it occurs only in ms. No. 861); in fact, its being totally identical to 57cd makes its wording (not its meaning) somewhat suspicious. Cf. also LT 14.38: *kuṇḍalāder yathā bhinnā na lakṣyā kanakasthitiḥ | na ca śakyā vinirdeṣṭuṃ tatrāpy asty eva sā dhruvam* ||.

⁷⁵ *sukha*^o ABEV, *sukhaṃ* C.

⁷⁶ *niṣedhanāt* ABC, *aviśeṣitā* EV (*aviśeṣitā* cit. in SpPr, p. 19, and all mss. Cf. LT 14.39 *evaṃ nityā viśuddhā ca sukhaduḥkhādyabheditā | svasaṃvedana-samvedyā mama saṃvinmayī sthitiḥ* ||).

⁷⁷ *nirvibhāgam adeśaṃ kālavarjitaṃ* BC, *nirvibhāgapade ṣaṭkālavarjitaṃ* A, *nirvibhāgapadaṃ saṅkaṭavarjitaṃ* EV.

⁷⁸ *tat* ABC, *yat* EV.

⁷⁹ *tvatkāraṇatvaṃ* ABC, *tvatkāraṇe tvaṃ* EV.

⁸⁰ *jñātaṃ* em. (cf. V), *jātaṃ* ABC, *jñāto* E.

⁸¹ *tvad*^o C, *tad*^o corrected to *tvad*^o ABC, *yad*^o EV.

⁸² The *ardhaśloka*, omitted in BC, in B has been later added in the margin.

⁸³ *tvayy anante ko nu deśaḥ* ABC, *tvayy ante ko 'nudeśaḥ syāt* EV.

- 1.66. *yat svarūpān na cyavate yat*⁸⁴ *parair nopādhīyate* |
yad anyair aparicchedyam tan nityam tvām vidur budhāḥ ||
- 1.67. *paricchedyaparicchittiyai*⁸⁵ *tvattaḥ kālādisambhavaḥ* |
*aprameyasvarūpasya tava kālādayo nu ke*⁸⁶ ||
- 1.73. *ity avajñātadeśāder akriyāḥ*⁸⁷ *jagadudbhavaḥ* |
*tvatto vivṛtṭyā*⁸⁸ *mantavyo na svarūpānyathāsthiteḥ* ||
- 1.89. *tvānuktvā*⁸⁹ *tvatparam*⁹⁰ *brūtaḥ*⁹¹ *saṃgatau*⁹² *vyāvahārikam* |
 ||⁹³
- 1.95. *śārīrajo vā śābdo vā manaso*⁹⁴ *vā samudgataḥ* |
vyavahāro 'py asau nāsti yatra tvaṃ nātha nāgrataḥ ||

*

- 2.5. *ātmā na meyaḥ kasyāpi tadanyan nopapadyate* |
*meyabhedān mānabhedas*⁹⁵ *tasyābhāve sa kiṃkṛtaḥ* ||
- 2.6. *ātmā yadi bhaven meyas tasya mātā bhavet paraḥ* |
*para ātmā*⁹⁶ *tadānīm syāt sa paro yas tu mīyate* ||
- 2.8. *svīkāro viṣayīkāraḥ sa tatrodghoṣyate budhaiḥ* |
*yad anyatra prasiddham tat saṃvidāḥ kim apohyate*⁹⁷ ||
- 2.9. *saṃvidāsvīkṛtaḥ*⁹⁸ *yac ca na tad viṣayasamjñitam* |

⁸⁴ *yat* ABC, *sat* EV.

⁸⁵ °*paricchittiyai* ABC, °*paricchinnais* EV.

⁸⁶ *nu ke* BC, *na ke* A, *na vai* EV.

⁸⁷ *ity avajñātadeśāder akriyāḥ* ABC, *ity eva jñātadeśāder akriyā*° EV.

⁸⁸ *vivṛtṭyā* ABC, *vivṛtyā* EV.

⁸⁹ *tvānuktvā* conj., *tvām uktvā* ABCEV.

⁹⁰ *tvat*° conj., *tat*° ABCEV.

⁹¹ *brūtaḥ* ABC, *brūmaḥ* EV.

⁹² *saṃgatau* BC, *saṃghatau* A, *sadgatau* EV.

⁹³ An *ardhaśloka* likely to have been omitted here.

⁹⁴ *manaso* AC, *manaso* corrected to *mānaso* B, *mānaso* EV (cit. SpPr, p.10 *mānaso*, and all mss.).

⁹⁵ *meyabhedān mānabhedas* ABC, *meyabhedātmāno bhedas* EV.

⁹⁶ *para ātmā* ABC, *parānyātmā* EV.

⁹⁷ *apohyate* AEV, *apodyate* C, *apodyate* corrected to *apohyate* B.

- yatsvīkṛtaṃ⁹⁹ tadātmaiva viṣayoktiḥ kva¹⁰⁰ tiṣṭhatām ||
- 2.17. saṃbandhaḥ siddhāyor nāsti nairākāṅkṣyeṇa vṛttitaḥ |
nāsiddhāyor asattvena tenāsau syān na vastutaḥ ||
- 2.22ab. nirastakarṭṛbhāveṣu¹⁰¹ karaṇatvādyasaṃbhavaḥ¹⁰² |
..... ||
- 2.32. paravyavasthāpi pare yāvan nātmīkṛtaḥ paraḥ |
tāvan na śakyate kartuṃ yato buddhaḥ paraḥ paraḥ ||
- 2.35. yathendriyair vinābhūtaṃ¹⁰³ viṣayair apy anāvīlam |
svataḥ prakāśate jñānaṃ viṣayo naivam iṣyate ||
- 2.36. tatrāhur¹⁰⁴ viṣayañāptyai yat pramāṇatrayaṃ pṛthak |
pṛthagviṣayasamyogān na tad abhyeti vedanam ||
- 2.37. sākṣāt samakṣadhīr arthāt saṃbandhād anumānadhīḥ |
te mūlam āgamasyaḥur iti nānyapramodbavaḥ ||
- 2.38. trayāṇām api mānānām pratibhāprāṇateṣyate |
samyānmithyātvanirñūter anyathānupapattitaḥ ||
- 2.39. svavittir eva pratibhā kartavyeṣv akramātmikā¹⁰⁵ |
nirmalā kathitā tajjñair yayā jīvanti jantavaḥ ||
- 2.44. jñāne 'py antaḥpraviṣṭasya bhāvasya yadi bāhyatā¹⁰⁶ |
jñānād eva tadā bāhyaṃ svam idānīm kim ucyatām ||
- 2.45. athāpraviṣṭo¹⁰⁷ vijñānaṃ sattāsya jñāyate kutaḥ |
jñānasyaivādhikāro 'sti¹⁰⁸ sadasanmārgaṇe yataḥ ||
- 2.54. anapekṣā satām siddher asiddher api nāsatām |

⁹⁸ EV read *saṃvidā svīkṛtaṃ* (also possible).

⁹⁹ *yat*° em., *tat*° ABC, *tat* EV.

¹⁰⁰ *kva* BCEV, *ku* A.

¹⁰¹ °*bhāveṣu* ABC, °*bhāve tu* EV.

¹⁰² *karaṇatva*° BC, *kāraṇatva*° AEV.

¹⁰³ EV read *vinā bhūtam*.

¹⁰⁴ *tatrāhur* ABC, *tatrāṅga*° EV.

¹⁰⁵ °*ṣv akrama*° em., °*ṣu krama*° ABCEV.

¹⁰⁶ *bāhyataḥ* corrected to *bāhyatā* B, *bāhyataḥ* ACEV.

¹⁰⁷ *athāpraviṣṭo* AC, *athāpravaṣṭo* B, *arthāpraviṣṭaṃ* EV.

¹⁰⁸ °*sti* ABEV, °*pi* C.

nirapekṣeṣu bhāveṣu na mātṛtvaṃ na meyatā ||

2.56. *prakāśate saṃvid ekā tadanyat tu prakāśyate* |

*prakāśyaṃ*¹⁰⁹ *ca bhavet karma tac ca kartrā*¹¹⁰ *vinā katham* ||

2.58. *vastuṣṭhityā na bando 'sti tadabhāvān*¹¹¹ *na muktatā* |

vikalpagaṭitāv etāv ubhāv api na kiṃcana ||

*

4.78cd. *tathā hy ukto madduhitrā*¹¹² *vāmadevyā haristutau* ||

*

5.26. *vāg evāśyāḥ kāraṇaṃ viśvavṛtter nyāyyaṃ*¹¹³ *caitan nāgamaḥ kevalo 'yam* |

nāsaṃkalpaṃ kiṃcid astīha kāryaṃ vācaṃ vinā na vikalpo 'sti kaścit ||

REFERENCES

Āgamaprāmāṇya

See VAN BUITENEN 1971

Bhāskarī

Bhāskarī. A Commentary on the Īśvarapratyabhijñānāvimarśinī of Abhinavagupta, vols. I-II, ed. K.A.S. Iyer and K.C. Pandey, Allahabad: The Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavana Texts 70 and 83, 1938-1950

VAN BUITENEN 1971

J.A.B. van Buitenen, *Yāmuna's Āgamaprāmāṇyam or Treatise on the Validity of Pañcarātra*, ed. and transl., Madras: Rāmānuja Research Society, 1971

CZERNIAK-DROŹDŹOWICZ forthcoming

M. Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, "Ekāyanaveda – in Search of the Roots," in M.S.G. Dyczkowski, N. Rastogi and R. Torella (eds.), *Proceedings of the XIV World Sanskrit Conference, Delhi Jan. 2012, Tantra-Āgama Section*, New Delhi: D.K. Print-world

¹⁰⁹ *prakāśyaṃ* A, *prakāśye* BCEV.

¹¹⁰ *kartrā* AEV, *kartā* BC.

¹¹¹ *tadabhāvān* ACEV, *tadā bhāvan* B.

¹¹² *tathā hy ukto madduhitrā* AB, *tathādyuktaṃ madduhitryā* EV.

¹¹³ *nyāyyaṃ* em. (cf. EV), *nyāyaṃ* A (*nyāyyaṃ* cit. SpPr, p. 9; the mss. oscillate between *nyāyaṃ* and *nyāyyaṃ*).

DASGUPTA 1932

S. Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. III, [Cambridge: 1932] Delhi: 1975

DYCZKOWSKI 1992

M.S.G. Dyczkowski, *The Stanzas on Vibration: the Spandakārikā with four commentaries* [...], transl. with an introduction and exposition, Albany: SUNY Press, 1992

GNOLI 1985

R. Gnoli, *Il Commento di Abhinavagupta alla Parātriṃśikā (Parātriṃśikātattvavivaraṇam)*, traduzione e testo, Roma: IsMEO, Serie Orientale Roma 58, 1985

GONDA 1970

J. Gonda, *Viṣṇuism and Śaivism: A Comparison*, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1970

GOODALL 1998

D. Goodall, *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Vol. I: chapters 1-6*, ed. and transl., Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, Publications du Département d'Indologie 86.1, 1998

GUPTA 1972

S. Gupta, *Lakṣmītantra. A Pāñcarātra text*, transl. and notes, Leiden: Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina 15, 1972

ĪPK

[*Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā*] See TORELLA 2002

Īśvarasiddhi

See *Sambandhasiddhi*

LT

Lakṣmī-tantra: A Pāñcarātra Āgama, ed. (with Sanskrit gloss) Pandit V. Krishnamacharya, Adyar: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, The Adyar Library Series 87, 1959

MMP

[*Mahārthamañjarīparimala*] *Mahārthamañjarī with the Autocommentary Parimala*, ed. Pt. V.V. Dvivedi, Varanasi: Yogatantra-Ratnamālā 5, 1972

Mṛgendravṛtti

Mṛgendrat Tantra (vidyāpāda and yogapāda) with commentary of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. M.K. Shastri, Bombay: Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 50, 1930

Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa

See GNOLI 1985

Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya

Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam, ed. M.R. Shastri, Srinagar: Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 3, 1918

RAI 1955

S.C. Rai, "Studies on the history of religion in ancient Kāśmīra," *The Journal of the Bihar research Society* 41.2, 1955

RASTELLI 2003

M. Rastelli, "The Ekāyanaveda in the Pāñcarātra tradition," paper read at the 12th World Sanskrit Conference in Helsinki, July 2003 (unpublished)

Sambandhasiddhi

In *The Siddhitrayī and the Pratyabhijñā-kārikā-vṛtti*, ed. M.K. Shastri, Srinagar: Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 34, 1921

SANDERSON 2007

A. Sanderson, "The Śaiva exegesis of Kashmir," in D. Goodall and A. Padoux (eds.), *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner*, Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, 2007, pp. 231-442

SANDERSON 2009a

A. Sanderson, "Kashmir," in K.A. Jacobsen (ed.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism, Volume One: Regions, Pilgrimage, Deities*, Leiden/Boston: Brill, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Zweite Abteilung, Indien, vol. XXII, 2009, pp. 99-126

SANDERSON 2009b

A. Sanderson, "The Śaiva Age," in Sh. Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, 2009, pp. 41-349

SP (Dyczkowski ed.)

The Saṃvitprakāśa by Vāmanadatta, ed. M.S.G. Dyczkowski, with English introduction, Varanasi: Ratna Printing Works, 1990

SP (Tripathi's ed.)

Saṃvitprakāśa of Vāmanadatta, ed. B.P. Tripathī 'Vāgīśa Śāstrī,' Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Laghu-Granthamālā 51, 1993

SpPr (Dyczkowski ed.)

The Spandapradīpikā: a Commentary on the Spandakārikā, ed. M.S.G. Dyczkowski, Varanasi: Ratna Printing Works, 1990

SpPr (Kaviraja ed.)

Spandapradīpikā utpalācāryaviracitā, ed. M.M.G. Kaviraja, in *Tantrasaṅgraha*, part I, *Yogatantragranthamālā* 3, Varanasi: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1970, pp. 83-128

Stavacintāmaṇi

Stavacintāmaṇi with vivṛti by Kṣemarāja, ed. M.R. Shastri, Srinagar: Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 10, 1918

Svacchandodyota

Svacchandatantra with commentary “Ud[d]yota” by Kṣemarāja, ed. V.V. Dwivedi, 2 vols., Delhi: Parimal Sanskrit Series 16, 1985

TORELLA 1979

R. Torella, “Due capitoli del Sarvadarśanasamgraha: Śaivadarśana e Pratyabhijñādarśana,” *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 53(3-4), 1979, pp. 361-410

TORELLA 1994

R. Torella, “On Vāmanadatta”, in P.-S. Filliozat, C.P. Bhatta and S.P. Narang (eds.), *Pandit N.R. Bhatt Felicitation Volume*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1994, pp. 481-498

TORELLA 2007a

R. Torella, “Studies in Utpaladeva’s *Īśvarapratyabhijñā-vivṛti*. Part I. *Apoha* and *anupalabdhi* in a Śaiva garb,” in K. Preisendanz (ed.), *Expanding and Merging Horizons. Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass*, Vienna: 2007, pp. 473-490

TORELLA 2007b

R. Torella, “Studies in Utpaladeva’s *Īśvarapratyabhijñā-vivṛti*. Part II. What is memory?”, in K. Klaus und J.-U. Hartmann (eds.), *Indica et Tibetica. Festschrift für Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*, Wien: Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 66, Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 2007, pp. 539-563

TORELLA 2009

R. Torella, “From an adversary to the main ally: The place of Bhartṛhari in the Kashmirian Śaivādvaita,” in M. Chaturvedi (ed.), *Bhartṛhari: Language, Thought and Reality*. Delhi: 2009, pp. 343-354

TORELLA 2013

R. Torella, “Inherited cognitions: *prasiddhi*, *āgama*, *pratibhā*, *śabdana* (Bhartṛhari, Utpaladeva, Abhinavagupta, Kumārila and Dharmakīrti in dialogue),” in V. Eltschinger and H. Krasser (eds.), *Scriptural Authority, Reason and Action, Proceedings of a Panel at the XIV World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto, September 1st-5th 2009*, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2013, pp. 455-480

TĀ

Tantrāloka Twith Commentary by Rājānaka Jayaratha, ed. M.K. Shastri, 12 vols., Allahabad/Srinagar/Bombay: Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 23, 28, 29, 30, 35, 36, 41, 47, 52, 57, 58, 59, 1918-1938

TS

Tantrasāra, ed. M.R. Shastri, Srinagar: Kashmir Series of Text and Studies 17, 1918

Vijñānabhairava

Vijñānabhairava with the commentary partly by Kṣemarāja and partly by Śivopādhyāya, ed. M.R. Shastri, Bombay: Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 8, 1918; with commentary *Kaumudī* by Ānanda Bhaṭṭa, Bombay: Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 9, 1918